

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 10-25 remain pending in this application. No claims have been canceled or added.

Priority

Applicants request that the Examiner acknowledge the claim for priority and safe receipt of the priority document. The priority document (JP 2003-300363, filed August 25, 2003) was filed with the initial application and is reflected in the Official Filing Receipt dated March 9, 2004.

Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor for conducting an interview with the undersigned and Applicants' representatives on October 25, 2005. Agreement was reached as stated in the interview summary. The arguments raised for patentability during the interview are including in the following remarks.

Information Disclosure Statement

On August 16, 2005 Applicants submitted and Information Disclosure Statement. Applicants request that the Examiner initial and return a copy of the

PTO-1449 Form filed with the IDS. A copy of the PTO-1449 Form is enclosed for the Examiner's convenience.

Another Information Disclosure Statement accompanies this response.

35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

Claims 10-14 and 17-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hubis et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,324). (Evidentiary references: Olarig (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0163028 and Moayyad et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,690,400). Claims 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hubis et al as applied to claim 10 and further in view of Moayyad et al. These rejections are traversed as follows.

The present invention is directed to changing the configuration in a first resource group so as to permit a first resource to change its state from relating to a second resource to relating to a third resource in the same first resource group. The first resource is not permitted to change to a third state which would allow it to relate to a fourth resource that is in a second resource group. In other words, while resources can change their state to relate to other resources within the same resource group, resources cannot be reconfigured to relate to resources in another resource group.

Hubis et al are silent as to changing the configuration of the relation of resources within a resource group. Hubis et al merely disclose a port mapping table

190 and a volume permission table 194 in Fig. 2B-3. According to these tables, Hubis et al decide which logical unit numbers (LUNs) can be accessed by each host in order to provide LUN security. Fig. 2B-2 shows volume name tables for each logical volume as well as the WWNs that can access each volume. Therefore, it should be clear that Hubis et al is merely directed to determining which volume each host can access and has nothing to do with the configuration of resources within a resource group. Since Hubis et al is silent with respect to such configuration of resources, it necessarily follows that Hubis et al is also silent with respect to not permitting resources to be reconfigured across resource groups.

Claim 18 of the present application discloses access permission for information processing devices to different storage regions in the first resource group. This is also a type of LUN security. However, the currently pending independent claims are directed to reconfiguring of resources within resource groups, which is neither disclosed or suggested by any of the cited references.

The Examiner points to numeral 182 in Fig. 2A for disclosing resource groups each having a plurality of resources. With respect to permitting a first resource to change from first state of relating to a second resource into a second state of relating to a third resource in the first resource group, the Examiner points to the logical volumes in Hubis et al that can be configured based on accessibility (citing column 5, lines 47-49). However, this portion of Hubis et al merely discloses that each logical volume may be configured to be visible to a single host computer 101 or to a

selected group of host computers (for example, 101-1 and 101-2). This is not the same as changing the configuration of the resources with respect to one another.

The deficiencies in Hubis et al are not overcome by resort to Olarig or Moayyad et al. The Examiner merely relies on Olarig for disclosing ECC groups. Furthermore, the Examiner merely relies upon Moayyad et al for disclosing partitioned storage devices. However, these references fail to cure the above-mentioned deficiencies in the primary reference to Hubis et al. As such, it is submitted that the pending claims patentably define the present invention over the cited art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By 
Shrinath Malur
Reg. No. 34,663
(703) 684-1120